LIBRARY
HAWAII KING ACADEMY

The Unitarian Christian

Vol. 14 FALL, 1958 No. 1

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

REPORT OF THE I.A.R.F. CONGRESS

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS AT CHICAGO
Carl R. Scovel

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF COMMUNION
Harry M. Stokes

A SOLDIER ASKS THE CHAPLAIN
Frank B. Crandall

LIFE'S EVERLASTING VALUES
Emil Engelhardt

A PRAYER
James Luther Adams

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S DESK

INTRODUCING OUR CONTRIBUTORS

31460

31460

EDITORIAL

The Reverend Charles Edwards Park, D.D., S.T.D., for forty years minister of the First Church in Boston, who retires as Editor of the UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN. He will continue as a member of the Editorial Board and Contributing Editor.

With this issue the UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN turns a corner, passing out of the hands of the former Editor-in-Chief, and into the hands of the new Editor-in-Chief, Rev. Charles C. Forman of Plymouth, Mass. His mailing address is simple enough to justify the hope that it will not be forgotten but very frequently used: Box 43, Plymouth, Massachusetts. This change in our modest story is hardly weighty enough to rob anyone of his or her slumbers, but it does give occasion for a few remarks.

Has this little quarterly justified its existence, and do we want to continue it? Is the *Unitarian Register* enough for us; does it meet all requirements? To answer intelligently, one must remember that, up to the time of its purchase by the American Unitarian Association, at which moment it became virtually a loyal and wholly uncritical "house organ," the *Unitarian Register* or rather the *Christian Register* was a completely independent publication, wearing no muzzle whatever, and nothing remotely resembling a muzzle. It was free to agree, and to approve the actions of the officers and directors of the Association; and it was just as free to disagree, criticize, suggest what it considered better policies. It was also free to offer its columns to any minister or layman, however obscure, who wished to get a hearing for his own ideas.

How valuable a service it rendered can, of course, never be accurately known. But no one can deny that any device that protects the privilege of free thought and free speech among us, not only protects, but offers opportunity for the actual exercise of that privilege, is to be looked upon with gratitude and a sense of security.

Doubtless that desire to defend and make possible free thought and free speech in our Fellowship was one of the motives which brought the UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN into existence. There were of course other motives: the desire to have available a sort of inter-communication system, through which lonely ministers could enjoy the delights and benefits of a Printer's Ink Bull Session; or through which ordinary run-of-the-mill minds could find and feel the stimulus of exchanging ideas, comparing notes, finding and giving both criticism and agreement.

We cannot claim that we have won any outstanding success in our effort to serve our body in these ways. Perhaps we have succeeded more than we think, perhaps less. We cannot know. But we are still perfectly sure that if this periodical were accepted and taken over by our fellow Unitarians, both lay and clerical, as their mouthpiece, or to use Dr. Crothers' figure, as their listening post, it could fill a very important place, and become a happy and welcome bit of real usefulness. With that hope and prayer the present Editor-in-Chief passes his responsibilities over to the younger hands and livelier perceptions of Charles C. Forman.

C. E. P.

THE UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN is published four times a year in October, December, March and May, by the Unitarian Christian Fellowship. (*President*, Rev. Paul H. Chapman; *Vice Presidents*, Mr. Marshall I. Stone, Mrs. Herbert Lyman; *Cor. Secretary*, Mr. Ralph Lazzaro; *Rec. Secretary*, Rev. Charles C. Forman; *Treasurer*, Mr. Constant Wendell.)

Editorial Board: Rev. Charles C. Forman, Ph.D., Chairman; Rev. Charles E. Park, D.D., S.T.D., Rev. Carl Bihldorff, Rev. Alan G. Deale, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Mr. Constant Wendell, Mr. Keith F. Warren.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: $1.00 a year payable to Treasurer, Constant Wendell, Unitarian Christian Publication Office, 102 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.

Entered as second class matter at Boston Post Office, Oct. 25, 1954.

REPORT OF THE I.A.R.F. CONGRESS

The sixteenth Congress of the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom was held in Chicago last August, bringing together more than one thousand delegates and observers from a score of countries to consider the theme, "Today's Religions Can Meet the World's Needs Today." It was my privilege to attend as a delegate of the Unitarian Christian Fellowship. The Congress was exciting and challenging for many reasons, not least being the opportunity to meet and talk with delegates of member groups from abroad and discovering new attitudes toward understanding widely divergent religious traditions. There were those present at the Congress who felt deeply that there must emerge in this twentieth century a world faith embracing all the great religious traditions of east and west. On the other hand there were present those possessing a deep conviction that we must *understand* the great religious traditions of the world but that there must also be a deepening awareness of the values worth preserving in those traditions. In short, we must understand each other, appreciate each other's insights, respect each other's differences. On the whole syncretism in religion was viewed critically and no serious consideration was accorded arguments favoring a synthetic religion. We possess common ideas and insights, and we possess differences of thought and conviction. Even among the Christian groups present at the Congress both areas of common consent and unique insight were evident. To preserve, not divisively but in a spirit of larger unity, what we hold in common and what is peculiar to each promises to rescue us from insularity without impoverishing the intellectual and spiritual forces of our respective traditions.

Rather than reviewing the schedule of the five-day-long Congress, or summarizing the major addresses presented each evening by representatives of Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Judaism respectively, or reporting on the business session where, in the opinion of a good number of delegates, the Americans behaved rather badly as hosts of our oversea guests, our readers will probably get a better sense of the mood of the Congress from some of the actual statements which were adopted. The *complete* text of the Preamble and two resolutions growing out of the panel on Philosophy and Theology makes its first appearance in these pages.

The Preamble of the 16th Congress of the I.A.R.F.

Today's Religions Can Meet the World's Needs Today

This is the theme of the Sixteenth Congress of the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom (I.A.R.F.). In adopting this theme the Congress makes a bold claim. It is by no means a claim of present accomplishment. Rather, it is a claim upon the future. It is the expression of a faith. It is the expression of a confidence in the resources that are available to men of contrite heart, to men who in the spirit of Jesus and the prophets of all great religions are willing to take risks for the sake of their faith.

We would be people of contrite heart, for we recognize that, in the face of the needs of men, religion today—including our own—has served to divide men as much as to unite them in human community. Similar divisions also appear between men who hold to a religious faith and men who believe that they must reject any religious faith. This divisiveness is due to our arrogance, including the arrogance of apathy.

It is easier to split the atom than to change or break old habits of thought and action, or to escape the bonds of our inherited culture or of our neighbors' opinions. New ways of understanding and cooperation cannot be found unless a new attitude of openness is adopted—an attitude ready to receive new insights and experiences, and to respond to them. We cannot find new ways unless we are willing to surrender our arrogance for the sake of newness of life. Only this attitude of openness can render us self-critical and disclose new possibilities of meeting responsibility.

In adopting the attitude of openness we recognize that none of our religious symbols adequately represents the resources of human fulfillment. All of our symbols are human creations; they come and go with time; they cannot be exempt from criticism; they must be understood anew; and sometimes they must be replaced.

Yet something more than openness is needed. Something more than the desire to overcome provincialism is required.

Men of the liberal faith are open not only to each other and to other religions. They are also open to what we call God—or the infinite, or the eternal, or the spirit—that which transcends and judges all religion and culture and which ever finds new and tangible expression in new situations. Each of these concrete expressions—material or verbal—will be lost in time, but there remains imperishable that transcendent reality which is embodied like a flame in the flow of changing things and symbols.

Each of the world's religions reflects this undying flame in its own way. Each possesses its characteristic perspectives which have taken shape through historical development and experience. Indeed, within each of the religions a certain variety of perspective obtains. We neither wish nor expect the varying perspectives to disappear. Nor do we expect them to lose their identity in synthesis or syncretism or "religion in general." The basic perspectives must be maintained in their own dynamic integrity.

The liberal religious outlook is freedom-loving, freedom-seeking, freedom-giving. This search for freedom calls for communication between the great traditions and perspectives for the dialogue that elicits creative integrity. Through sympathetic con-

versation between perspectives, there emerges new mutual understanding, new discovery of the latent meanings of the perspectives, and new recognition of common responsibilities. Of such genuine dialogues we refuse to predict or to prejudge the outcome. To prejudge is to impede or pervert the conversation. Genuine conversation leads to new possibilities. Precisely this confidence in communication is the confidence that a power greater than ourselves, and greater than we know, works when we respond to its demands. It is out of this conversation with others and with the transcendent that integrity over-comes arrogance with creative love.

But the conversation between the perspectives does not take place in a vacuum. The conversation must concern itself with the vital needs of men. Otherwise, it can become a form of escapism. The escape may be into indifference to the demands made upon us, an escape into merely contemplative mysticism, into tranquilizing piety, or into sophisticated despair. The danger of escapism, of artificial conversation, is to be avoided only if the needs and experiences of all sorts and conditions of men, individual and collective, are taken into account.

Where the vital needs of men are recognized and served, there genuine religion is present—whether its language be secular or sacred.

These needs must be reassessed at each time and place if our concern with them and with the vitality of religion is to be serious and revelant. This IARF Congress has drawn upon the experiences of persons of many lands and faiths, and of many vocations and professions. Among areas of human need, it has found these outstanding: 1) The survival of mankind and the prevention of atomic war; 2) the preservation and increase of areas of human freedom and the widening of opportunities for peaceful change; 3) the moderation of tensions among nations, races, and religious and social groups; 4) the more equitable distribution and adjustment of human and economic resources, including greater aid to underdeveloped areas; 5) more adequate mutual understanding and adjustment between science and religion; 6) the development of living values in new forms of art, education, worship and religious discipline.

Whereas theology has been and is the intellectual expression of organized religion, and

Whereas the liberal churches must re-examine and restate their faith in contemporary terms, and

Whereas the liberal churches, if they are to be true to their genius and traditional concerns, must once again participate in the theological conversations within and beyond Christianity,

Be it resolved that we call upon our member groups and especially the clergy and lay leaders of member groups, to

1. recognize the need in these days of theological relevance,
2. to inform themselves of contemporary theological concerns and issues,
3. to deal seriously with the questions currently being raised in theological and philosophical circles.

I. PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

All of man's great religions have changed through the centuries as new knowledge and mutual contact required. While recognizing this, we do not aim at any syncretism or artificial forcing of this process. Our goal is understanding between the historic faiths. Rightly conceived, this will reduce tensions and eliminate unessential and diverse ideas and practices.

To us, understanding is only possible when we begin with sympathetic appreciation of the attempts of all men to comprehend their cosmic and human surroundings and when we reject all claims to possess final truth. Our world is, in fact, changed by the process of our coming to know it, and this, in turn, continuously changes us. We help this highest human growth by the critical appropriation of all the insights of the traditions and the equally critical abandonment of all that blocks human growing and knowing.

Our liberal tradition has flourished when certain tendencies have been dominant. The rejection of dogma has never been an end in itself, but has appeared when the dynamic quality of truth and experience was recognized, and when it was seen that men could only discover more truth in a climate of freedom. Free men are no longer permitted to coerce others, but know that they must persuade men by reason. The sciences and philosophy, as concrete expressions of expanding human reason, have therefore continuously reshaped our religious living. In our insistence upon "salvation by character," we have at the same time insisted that reason could be, and must be, directed also toward human problems. And finally, our affirmation of man's dignity has gone hand in hand with the conviction that each man must be helped to fulfill his own potentialities.

Theology is the attempt to think critically about the religious life of the community. At the same time, such reflection reconstructs the community. Although liberals do not insist upon any particular theological system, they have always been aware of the need for theological thinking. The freezing of traditional theologies, developed in static, pre-scientific and pre-industrial cultures, have been unable to help modern man solve modern problems. Liberal religion therefore, and liberal theology, including the liberal interpretation of tradition, have an increased relevance in today's world.

All men are finally on the threshold of such a mastery of nature that, while it still menaces them with destruction, nevertheless holds out for the first time the realizability of universal welfare. Traditional theologies, based upon self-denial as a solution to poverty, will not guide us here. Liberal theology, nurtured in modern culture, is in a better position to articulate an ethic for the coming abundance.

C. C. F.

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS AT CHICAGO

Carl R. Scovel

"Today's religions can meet the world's needs today." With this cheerful motto in mind, the sixteenth congress of the I.A.R.F. set out upon the course of their five-day program in Chicago this summer, starting August 9. By the second day, however, most of the delegates had probably forgotten this slogan (without even bothering to put a question mark at the end of it) and had turned their intellectual energies to the several specific questions at hand.

Delegates attended one panel discussion a day. The varied panels dealt with philosophy and theology, science and religion, worship and education, growing tensions, international relations, and economic forces. In the evening they gathered at the beautiful Rockefeller Chapel to hear a speech on one of the five great religions of the world. And in between these formal sessions of the conference they talked, chatted, and conversed at breakfasts, teas, luncheons, dinners and any other occasion that offered the slightest pretext for informal discussion. Morning chapel services rounded out the life of the Congress.

I suppose that I could use the rest of my space here describing the content of the lectures and resolutions. But you may read these elsewhere and I would like to tackle a description of something which I feel is much more significant —that is the *problems* which we encountered at Chicago or, *in a sense,* how the conference failed. I must do this from my admittedly subjective viewpoint and use the first person singular. And let me add, that I can report these problems only because I am vastly convinced of the worth of the conference this past summer, and the great need for more conferences in time to come.

People who go to conferences are lifted for a few days out of the prison of their daily routine. They live in a new exciting world under the exhilarating pressure of high ideals and in the hope of making a brave resolution—either within themselves or as a public statement. Delegates come from a world where, by and large, they cannot control the forces around them. And so, in a sense, they hope at the conference to control this world through the manipulation of words—verbal symbols. In the few days that are set aside they hope to gain some intellectual and rational control over the stream of life that flows about them. And this ordering of life through the processes of reason is called "understanding."

The people who came to Chicago set for themselves the task of rationally understanding each other's religions and beliefs. Towards this intellectual end they heard speeches from learned men and discussed ideas and problems among themselves. Perhaps what they did not realize was that they, among *themselves,* formed a religious and an inter-religious community. They were not only thinking, but actually living out the process of understanding. And, while they were talking about need for religious communication, they in their lives at the conference were beginning this very process of religious communication. Thus, I believe, the real value of the conference lay not so much in the speakers and the panels, but in the conference *life*—the actual daily give and take in intellectual discussions, and also in the thousand pedestrian details of community living. In the context of lectures and life, I think two important conclusions may be drawn.

1. *There are differences, important differences, between religions.* One cannot gloss over these differences with the benign generalizations of the myth of universal religion. They are real—they are there. For instance, Zafrulla Kahn, speaker for Islam, continually quoted the Koran in support of the religious beliefs which he propounded. His whole idea seemed to be "It's in the book." In this case, the book was the Koran; we now know that not all the fundamentalists are within Christianity. Some people objected that Khan was not a true liberal. No, he is not. But he is what the Mohammedans would call a Mohammedan. And if we are to deal with the religion of Islam seriously, we must consider it in the light in which its adherents view it.

There has been a lot of easy eclecticism in vogue during these years, and if the Chicago conference did any one thing, it should have pointed out the futility and unreality of religious syncretism. We have seen several "universal religions" floating around, and the fact is that these "religions" simply do not deal seriously with the religions they propose to unite. Their idea of making of several religions one religion is to take a bit from this faith and a bit from that—a symbol here and a symbol there—a rubric here and a rite there. At worst, these universal religions are an amalgamation of "golden rules" and other moral homilies.

But if one is going to select parts from various religions, we must ask by what standards one makes his selection. If a person chooses primarily those passages relating to social and moral duties, then he is primarily concerned with ethical behaviour. This, to him, is religion, and the various world faiths are only grist for his particular mill. If a person selects only those statements relating to the existence and power of God, he is primarily a universal theist, and, again, the religions are only useful in buttressing his particular point of view. If a person selects those statements and beliefs, emphasizing the depravity and incompleteness of man, then he is a fatalist first—a universal religionist, second. By and large the "universal religions" which I have seen, are more particular and narrow-minded than the religions which they hope to supersede.

The first step for a person who hopes for a uniting of the world's faiths, is to understand each religion thoroughly. And to do this he must begin with one religion, and I would think that the best religion to start with is the religion of our Western culture, Christianity. We must avoid the charge of Emerson who said, "Thy charity abroad is spite at home." Unless a person can sympathetically understand the theology and worship of the Christian church, he has no chance of really understanding other religions.

A person who denounces the Trinity as polytheism and nothing more, will be horrified by the pantheon of Hindu gods. A person who has no idea of the meaning of salvation through Jesus Christ cannot possibly grasp the significance of the Buddha in Mahayana Buddhism. How can a person who quickly calls a communion service a blood feast understand the services of sacrifice which the Hindus and the Buddhists celebrate? The real point is that many people, admittedly not all, who profess an interest in universal religion, have no interest in the specific religions at all. They only wish to adorn their sect with the admirable slogan of being "universal." They are universal only in the sense that they hope the world will some day turn to them for salvation—and of course, here they are most unrealistic.

And so the people at Chicago found that there are differences between religions. The speaker for Buddhism was eloquent and charming, but I found some of his "Mind over matter" beliefs uncomfortably close to the teachings of Mrs. Eddy. The Christian church has tried to avoid this sort of thinking with its doctrine of the Incarnation. Again, I enjoyed the warmth and power of Rabbi Freehof's words, but, although I have attended services for the Passover and bar-mitzvah, I never expect to be admitted to the religious community of Judaism. If we are to find our common ground, our likenesses, we must give equally serious attention to our differences.

2. There was a second discovery which I think we delegates made at Chicago. This was our finding the *real practical difficulties, of communication between peoples of different cultures, and, thusly, religions.* I could hardly understand the words of the speakers for Hinduism and Islam. And yet, who am I, who cannot speak a word of Arabic or Hindi, to criticize these gentlemen for their imperfect English? The language barrier is real. The space barrier is another factor, super-sonic flight not withstanding. There were several hundred Americans present, but only about 150 foreign delegates. The same situation may be reversed when the Congress is held in Europe or Asia—except that we will be the foreigners then. The simple problem of transportation is a terrific barrier to understanding. Only when we begin to live with one another, on a permanent basis, will we have to face the real need for synthesis and compromise. Community Church in New York is the only one I know where a significantly large foreign constituency makes this a real problem. There was also the barrier of knowledge. From many of the conversations I heard I felt that not too many delegates knew about religions other than Christianity. Perhaps, the conference helped us in discovering our ignorance, for, indeed, this is the beginning of knowledge.

If you should ask a delegate from the conference what he liked best about the summer gathering, he would probably say, "The people I met there." Here lies the key to the success of the Congress. It was in the community life, and not in the parade of intellectualizations, that the Congress really contributed to religious unity and understanding. For we know religions best, not through books and speeches, but through persons — individuals. Having met the genial emissaries of liberal Buddhism and Christianity in Japan, one could not help but want to know more about their church. The friendships with men like Hans Casparis, or Andre Bouvier, or Jacob Amstutz provide the motivation for knowing more about the Continental churches and the beliefs which they represent. When one has sat at several meals with the Imam of the mosque in Woking, England, one is inevitably disposed to feel warmly towards and to want to know more about this religion. And through these harbingers of good will and unity, one can find the stimulation of new ideas and hopes. It is in such a setting that religious unity is fostered.

On the last evening of the Congress we gathered together—Unitarian, Moslem, Jew, and all —in the sanctuary of the First Unitarian Church. There we listened to the reading of one another's sacred writings and to the music of one another's faith. Then we filed out, our candles lit from the light of all religions, and singing—

> "Shine forth, O Light, that we may see
> The meaning and the mystery."

Here is our real hope of unity—here in the Light that lights the different candles of all men. I suppose in this way we Unitarians believe in the ultimate unity of God. And if there is no unity here, there is surely none elsewhere.

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF COMMUNION

Harry M. Stokes

One of the most reassuring signs of theological health among Unitarians is the contemporary concern for a fresh evaluation of our Christian symbols, and their importance within our liberal churches. Under the influence of Ernst Cassirer in philosophy, Jung in psychology, Paul Tillich in theology, and the liturgical studies of Von Ogden Vogt, there is a growing appreciation for the essentially symbolic character of man's worship, and the depths of meaning and value which

may be communicated obliquely, by mnemonic action and suggestion within the worship service.

The service commemorating the Last Supper or Holy Communion is the most universally practiced "symbolic act" (apart from Baptism) in the whole Christian Church. Among Unitarians this service is all too frequently misunderstood, and hence neglected, or considered irrelevant because of "orthodox" interpretations surrounding it. But this situation of misunderstanding and neglect is not without remedy, if we seriously examine the background from which this service emerged, and see what conditions governed its formation and shaped its classical pattern. It will be seen that those conditions are as operative today, and as valid for our liberal churches as they were in the first centuries of Christianity. To be sure, the cosmological and theological doctrines of two millennia ago are not those we today accept, but the inner dynamics behind congregational association in worship are essentially no different for modern man than for the ancient Christian. Nor should we allow the specter of "orthodoxy" to darken and distort our appreciation of a treasure, which rightfully belongs to all Christians, whether they be of an orthodox or liberal persuasion, any more than we would surrender the *Bible* to the literalist, because we differ in our interpretation of its meaning.

The Last Supper, Holy Communion, or the Eucharist (*eucharistia* in Greek means "thanksgiving," and was the name given to this service in the second century A.D.) is, and always has been the most complete act of formal Christian worship. Within its structure are woven the perennial themes of Christian devotion and aspiration; praise, confession, the assurance of forgiveness, dedication, intercessory prayer, instruction, edification, inspiration, consecration, sacrifice, adoration, thanksgiving, communion, and benediction. It is the one service of prayer and praise belonging to the whole Church, and the privilege of every Christian. Unlike private forms of prayer this is an expression of the total congregation united in thanksgiving, celebrating together the continuing presence of the Christ-Spirit in their midst. It is a formal recognition of man's organic inter-relatedness in a society dedicated to the promotion of God's kingdom on earth. It is symbolic, that is, it points to man's dependence upon God for ultimate nourishment and life, and that life which man shares with the rest of creation. Because the Eucharist is public rather than private, objective rather than subjective, out-ward moving rather than in-ward centered, it acts as a mirror in which the congregation sees itself united in one body as a "people of God" sharing throughout time and space those free gifts of the Spirit, which Paul described as "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control." In the act of communing together with God we catch a glimpse of the invisible unity of the universal Church . . . "for as in one body we have many members, and all the members do not have the same function, so we, though many, are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another." Finally, in his participation in the Eucharist, the Christian offers himself to God, dedicating his life to the Source of all good, and consecrating himself to "the Way, the Truth, and the Life" as understood in the words of Jesus: "This do in remembrance of me." No other service belonging to the whole church can display so broad and high a range of meaning or sound so clearly the chords of a religious reality to which all men are capable of responding.

In the *New Testament* (Acts xx.7 ; ii.42 and 46 ; I Corinthians x.16 and xi.20) the service of the Eucharist is called simply "the Breaking of Bread," and belonged properly to the table fellowship of the Jewish followers of Jesus. In the non-Jewish or Gentile Christian circles, which rapidly multiplied due to Paul's missionary labors, this table fellowship became the congregational center of Christian worship, and it is from this early source that we inherit the Eucharist as a distinctive Christian ordinance.

For the Jewish Christians of the first century, the Eucharist belonged to a familiar pattern of communal meals. It was primarily a fellowship meal during which Jesus' actions and sayings were commemorated against the historical significance of his Messianic ministry, and especially his death on the cross during the Passover season. Combined with this observance was the fervent hope that he would soon return and inaugurate the full Messianic age in glory. Through this early apostolic period Jewish Christian worship continued formally in the regular synagogue and at the great temple in Jerusalem. There was as yet no severing of ties with the worship life of traditional Judaism. This is evident from Paul's attendance at the synagogues in the various countries he visited around the Mediterranean world as described in the Acts.

However, in 70 A.D. after the probable death of all the apostles, the temple at Jerusalem was destroyed by the Roman armies of the Emperor Titus, and Palestine ceased to be a religiously self-governing state. This catastrophe for all the Jewish peoples marked the end of the Christian leadership of the Jerusalem church, and Jewish Christianity ceased to be a formative agency in the rapidly developing "house-churches" of the Graeco-Roman world. At the opening of the second century the ecclesiastical power and leadership had passed from the original Jewish Christians to their Hellenistic and

Roman Christian brethren, and the customs of the Gentile churches became normative.

Like the Jewish Christians from whom they had learned the custom, the Gentile Christians met regularly on the first day of the week for a congregational meal which was accompanied by readings from the Law and the Prophets, the singing of psalms, possibly the public reading of one of Paul's letters, and finally after prayers the formal "breaking of bread" in remembrance of Christ and in the hope of his speedy return. Over bread and wine, which had been specially set apart from the communal stores, the president or bishop of the congregation pronounced a "free" prayer of thanksgiving (eucharistia), and then deacons distributed these elements to the people. Here in the ancient "house-churches" was a visible symbol of Christian brotherhood which encompassed all races and cut through all class barriers. To the sick and the infirm, who were unable to be present at the meal, the deacons carried a portion along with money and other tangible aid, reminding them of their real place in the Christian community of love. No one was neglected in the fellowship. We have the literary witness of that hostile critic, the Hellenistic satirist Lucian of Samosata, testifying to this unusual phenomenon: "The activity of these people (Christians) in dealing with any matter that affects their community is something extraordinary; they spare no trouble, no expense." In the ancient world the community of the church was extraordinary. Its inclusion of slaves, freemen, Jews, Greeks, Romans, Syrians, and others could be matched by no other organization. The use of bread and wine at the center of its worship contrasted remarkably with the blood sacrifices of other religious groups. Its social concern penetrated areas which the "enlightened" philosophy of the times never reached, and its moral transformation of ancient society was attested on all sides by opposition and persecution. But, unlike their Jewish Christian brethern, the Gentile Christians did not have the formal synagogue as their place of worship; what they had was their own creation, the "house-church" with the Eucharist as their focal point of worship. It is from this source, via the medieval Mass, that we derive our contemporary services of Protestant worship, not from the Jewish synagogue or the Jerusalem temple with which Jesus and his disciples were familiar.

The frequently argued, though rather irrelevant problem of whether or not Jesus himself ever intended to institute a perpetual communion rite never entered the minds of primitive Christians. The Eucharist was their way of meeting together for worship, and the corner-stone of their fraternal unity. Modern biblical scholarship sees quite clearly that Jesus himself neither "instituted," in the sense of envisioned and ordained the Christian service, nor for that matter selected any 11 o'clock Sunday morning observance as the special medium of God's worship. The Eucharist or Communion, like all subsequent forms of worship, is the treasured product of an evolutionary development within the corporate life of the Church, which in turn, is the response of men to the spirit of the Christ at work in the world. In the weekly, and later daily, celebration of the Eucharist the memory and ministry of Jesus continued to dwell vividly with his followers, and gave them a concrete focus of loyalty and hope. The "worshipping" church was the "communion of saints" bound by a common participation in the Communion sacrifice to him who had given his life in the actualization of the kingdom of God. In this sense Paul stressed the unity of Christians as "one body" in Christ. Never at any time was the church a loose collection of isolated individuals, bent on the completion of their own autonomy apart from the good of the whole society. Only in this way did Christianity survive the moral, social and intellectual disintegration of ancient society. And only along similar lines will liberal Christianity be able to withstand the internal and external pressures of atomistic individualism which now threaten to dissolve the very fabric of church life. This is a problem of great urgency for Unitarians who value freedom no less than genuine Christian commitment. For this reason the spiritual dynamics behind the observance of the Eucharist are as important today for Unitarians as they were in the ancient church.

It is not uncommon to find many liberals today who praise the faith and simplicity of the *New Testament,* and in particular the portrait of Jesus found in the first three gospels. But it is far less common knowledge that this very portrait was composed within a worshipping community which practiced the Eucharist or Communion as its form of service. The feeding of the multitudes recounted in these gospels has been interpreted by some modern scholars as a kind of parabolic reference to the Communion celebrated in the church of the first century with its historical foreshadowing written back into the ministry of Jesus. Nor is it by accident that the first three gospels record the specific event of the Last Supper as an occurrence of more than momentary worth. Moreover the evidence of Paul's letters points clearly to an apostolic warrant for the service, even before our present gospels were composed.

The question we must try to answer is why the symbolic use of bread and wine was so important in the worship life of the ancient church, and how this importance can be translated into terms relevant to the contemporary liberal Christian. In the gospel according to Luke (written about 75-85 A.D.) there is a curious story

of two disciples of Jesus (who were not numbered among the Twelve) who met a stranger on their way home to Emmaus from Jerusalem three days after the crucifixion. They explained to the stranger why they were sad, and what events had transpired in Jerusalem. The stranger in turn began to interpret the Scriptures concerning the Messiah. When they reached Emmaus, they invited the stranger to stay and dine with them. And at the moment when he blessed, and broke the bread and gave it to them, "their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished from their sight." This story, written long after the event it purports to describe, suggests that the "risen" Christ of Easter morning, the Christ of the resurrection narratives, came to his disciples when they were all together or in small groups at table "behind closed doors," dining among themselves as Jesus once had dined with them. The Last Supper then becomes overwhelmingly significant as a pre-figuration of the resurrection experience. The preparatory explanation of the crucifixion which occurred at the Last Supper was given by Jesus in the form of an injunction: "This is my body which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of me . . . . This cup is the covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." The Last Supper was therefore not only a real meal, but it was Jesus' way of explaining his impending death, and the meaning he attached to it. But besides, being a parabolic explanation, Jesus' words were also an entreaty. When they came together to "break bread" the disciples were to remember his covenant with them. The Messianic banquet table had been prepared, and Jesus as their leader, their friend, and their host, had given his life as a self-sacrifice for them, their Paschal lamb, and had gone to prepare the way for them in God's kingdom. In this sense, the resurrection accounts are intimately related to the Last Supper, and Jesus' admonition to recall him when the disciples gathered together to eat. This view is further warranted by the ardent hope of the primitive church that Jesus would return "in glory" very soon and gather his faithful followers into the Messianic kingdom. As Paul explains to the Corinthians: "For as often as you eat this bread, and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till he comes." The death of Jesus was a voluntary death, a self-sacrifice on behalf of the kingdom, which he hoped to see inaugurated. And the "breaking of bread" and drinking of the cup among the disciples and their adherents was their way of concretely embodying the memory of Jesus as well as the hope of his return. But it was more than mere memory or fervent hope, it was also a symbolic explanation of the continuing Christ-Spirit in their midst. The continual re-enactment of the Last Supper thus looked to two dimensions, that of the historical ministry and death of Jesus, and to the future when the Messiah in the glory of God would return, "for God has put all things in subjection under his feet." But it was the dimension of the present which made the Supper so valuable. The spirit of Jesus, the Messiah of Jewish hope and expectation, was a living reality in the congregation of his faithful. "Ye are the body of Christ" said Paul, and whether Jew or Gentile, bond or free, male or female, you "have been all made to drink into one Spirit." It was this overwhelming sense of group solidarity in spite of ethnic tensions and diversities of background, that found its symbolic expression in the Eucharist. In the little Christian congregations scattered over the Mediterranean world the presence of the Christ-Spirit lived on, and continued the ministry of reconciliaton between man and God. For this reason it is irrelevant to speculate on the question of Jesus' founding the church or "instituting" the celebration of the Eucharist. The central and most basic occasion for both was the life, teachings, and death of Jesus. Without him, and without men's response to him, there would have been no Christianity, as today there is no Christianity where his spirit and men's response to that spirit are lacking or negative.

It has sometimes been objected that the Communion is really a pagan embellishment of an essentially simple observance. This criticism can be substantiated in some of the later developments which took place in "eucharistic" practice. But these later developments and accretions should never blind us to the actual and clearly Christian foundation of the service and its meaning. From the first century to the twentieth, the Communion has preserved, although often with distortion, the intention of him who asked his disciples to remember him.

Because of doctrinal and liturgical elaboration a vital understanding of the Eucharist has been lost in many of our liberal Christian churches which attempt to preach, promote, and practice "pure" Christianity. With the loss of meaning this service has been relegated to the periphery of worship, and in some instances completely abandoned. It is always a short step from subordination to relegation to total abandonment. For this reason it is imperative for Unitarians to restore this service to its rightful place, and re-vitalize our worship life with a deeper understanding of its universal religious significance. We can hardly begin to appreciate non-Christian religions, if we fail to grasp the depths of our own Christian heritage. Should we allow the practice of the Eucharist to be the special preserve and privilege of non-liberal forms of Christianity, we will have signally failed in that broad discipleship to truth from which our Unitarian movement had its origin. Worship claims not only the intellect of man in its service, but

the emotions and will in a higher form of commitment than that now generally expressed among us on Sunday morning. Spiritual as well as intellectual and emotional impoverishment is always a besetting danger when we blindly cast aside our Christian symbols without first understanding their value. As a Unitarian, Professor Francis Greenwood Peabody was well aware of this when he wrote: "What the church of the Spirit has to fear is the neglect of its own possessions, the decline of spirituality, the hardening of the spiritual arteries, the ossification of the soul." And the Reverend Henry Whitney Bellows of the All Souls Unitarian church in New York was more than modern in his estimate: "You must not imagine that Christianity is everywhere and nowhere; everything and nothing; a vague sentiment; another name for virtue; the mere synonym of goodness and truth. It is a religion of facts, an historical, positive faith, supporting and illustrating and embodying its doctrines in the incidents of Christ's career, and demanding for itself visible incarnation in a discipline, a worship, and a church."

What then can the Eucharist mean for contemporary Unitarians? It is certainly not indicative of our general acceptance of the classical doctrine of the blood atonement. Nor is it our intention to eat, even symbolically, the flesh and blood of Christ. The problems of transubstantiation and consubstantiation are not of our concern except as interesting historical interpretations of the value of this service in the thought and lives of reformation and medieval Christians. But today as Unitarians, we are dedicated to the promotion and diffusion of that religion whch Jesus taught as love to God, and love among men. Where more clearly do we find this symbolized than in the Eucharist? Here we have that memorial of his self-sacrifice brought into contemporary focus. Here, we have depicted that concern for one another which expresses itself in the common sharing of the bread and the cup. With Christ as the host, we come equally to the same table, and dedicate ourselves to that love which he embodied by his death on the cross. As members "one of another" we find our unity not in uniformity of belief, but in his life, which we would make our own. Here is found that spiritual relation which embraces a plurality of beliefs, a unity of commitment amid a diversity of interpretations. Rooted in history, the Eucharist is a memorial, but it is a memorial with commitment. It is the self-dedication or pledge of each member of the congregation to embody the life of Christ, to live as the creative Spirit demands "in unity and godly love." The Latin word *sacramentum*, meaning oath or pledge of service, conveys this feature of the eucharistic offering. This is that reasonable service, the offering of self, "our souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice" in the cause of God's kingdom. This was the offering of Christ, and it is the offering we make "in remembrance" of him. This is an offering of the present as well as of the past, for not only those who have labored on behalf of man, but for the many which must continue to labor, and die in this present for the sake of righteousness.

But the Eucharist is even more than a pledge of fidelity. It is profound gratitude and thanksgiving (*eucharistia*) for the life we share with one another. It is our supreme act of praise for that life of the Spirit which inwardly nourishes, and for the life of creation by which we are nourished outwardly. In many ways the Eucharist is one long prayer of adoration and praise for the "good news" which reconciles us to God. For this reason the Eucharist is "celebrated" as a joyous occasion, and not as a pious duty.

In its use of bread and wine the Eucharist is also a celebration of the creation as the handiwork of God and sacred to our use. A false puritanism which would reject the use of material elements in the Eucharist, implicitely denies and rejects the material creation in which we live, and our relation to the world. For we are dependent upon the world for our life, and we would share real bread with those who hunger, and real wine with those who thirst. In this, its material and spiritual dimensions, the Eucharist reminds us of our own nature, and our need of one another in the world. Spirit and matter are not set over against one another in a false dualism, but are seen as proper constituents in the life of creation, equally deriving their existence from God, the Creator of heaven and earth. We worship *with* bread and wine, but not *to* bread and wine; just as we use hymnals from which to sing, organs to fill our churches with music, books from which to read, and flowers for decoration. These are all material, and they all have their place in our worship. God is a God of the whole creation, material as well as spiritual. But further, we have in the symbolic use of bread and wine a visible and graphic parable of the Last Supper as used by Jesus himself, and hallowed by centuries of usage. Both are universally understood and religiously meaningful whether in the ancient or modern world.

The Eucharist, besides being a memorial, a pledge of fidelity, and an act of thanksgiving, is also the expression of a universal hope. "Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from every evil, and make it perfect in Thy love; and gather it together from the four winds, the holy Church Universal, into Thy kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it." The ideal of mankind united in peace, made perfect in charity, stretching back into the past and moving forward into the future when the purposes of creation shall reach their fulfillment . . . this is the hope of the

Eucharist as men and women in every age and of every race and condition have received the bread and wine. It is the resolve to live in the kingdom as Jesus so resolved on the night in which he was betrayed: "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." Thus the Eucharist bids us look to the future, as well as inspires us from the past, and sustains us in the present.

Finally, the Eucharist is Communion. We commune with God in the presence of one another, because we acknowledge ourselves as "members one of another" and responsible for one another before God. As Christ shared his life with his disciples so we are called upon to share our lives with one another. Together we unite our hearts, "and lift them up unto the Lord." Jesus, according to the Fourth Gospel, once spoke of himself as the Vine and his disciples as the Branches. The poetry of the Communion allows us to see how we are rooted to that Vine from which all life proceeds. The symbol of the Communion service points to real communion between God and man, and it is here that Unitarians share with Christendom the need of spiritual renewal.

Today we journey along a road in a direction which is far from clear, and the Christ is in many ways a stranger in our midst. We have searched the scriptures and understood their meaning, and yet they remain closed. Is this not the time to invite the Stranger to dwell with us? "Abide with us; for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent." And then may we not hope that as we break bread together, our eyes will be opened, and we will understand that mission to which we have been entrusted? This is the edge of that mystery which surrounds, and ought to surround all true and living worship. We cannot fathom its depths or measure its dimensions, but we can "lift up our hearts" with the Psalmist and sing:

What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits toward me?
I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord.
I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all his people.
Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.
O Lord, truly I am thy servant; I am thy servant, and the son of thine handmaid: thou hast loosed my bonds.
I will offer to thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and will call upon the name of the Lord.
I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all his people,
In the courts of the Lord's house, in the midst of thee, O Jerusalem.
Praise ye the Lord!

A SOLDIER ASKS THE CHAPLAIN

Chaplain (Major) Frank B. Crandall, USA, Ret.

The subject comes out of an incident in World War II. It reflects both the wholesome relation of Chaplain and soldier and the widespread doubts and misunderstandings among soldiers reared in authoritarian churches.

The soldier and the Chaplain, seasoned in more than one war, have a mutual sense of *belonging* that seems to be deeper than the relation of pastor and parishioner in the civilian parish. The Chaplain is the soldier's pastor by official authority. His services are the soldier's without fee or reward, like the services of the medical officer. The soldier may confide in his Chaplain with the assurance of safety from dangers of discipline, possible in the family parish back home.

One of the most worthwhile functions of the military Chaplain is the pastoral conference, either in the discussion group or, intimately, in personal problem cases. The latter is confessional in nature. It's not the routine narration of sins of commission or omission with the imposition of penalties. It's a frank dealing with all the circumstances of a personal problem of faith or morals.

The sergeant began by saying, "Padre, I have known you long enough to be sure that I can trust you for understanding and sympathy and that I can be entirely frank and that you will not be shocked. My late father, God rest his soul, was that kind of a man. My parish priest would, I fear, be shocked. He'd probably threaten me or give me the brush off. My problem is a serious problem about the sacraments of my church.

I said, "Sergeant, lay the problem on the line. Maybe I'll find some misunderstanding on your part in this matter. I'll say so, if I do. What is your particular problem?"

The sergeant replied, "I'm a Roman Catholic and I think that the sacraments of the Church are the bunk."

"Sergeant, did you study Latin in high school and do you recall ever hearing what the word *sacrament* comes from?"

"Padre, I can't say that I ever heard."

"My copy of *The Catholic Encyclopedia Dictionary* says that the word comes from the Latin *sacra res*, meaning a sacred thing. Did you ever hear of the Latin word *sacramentum?* Our word

comes directly from that and has a special meaning for soldiers."

"What's that, Padre?"

"If you look in any Latin dictionary, you'll find just one meaning for the word *sacramentum*. It's the oath of office taken by the Roman soldier. Whatever you may think of sacraments, both you and I have taken the *sacramentum* when, years ago, we became soldiers. I know that that oath is as sacred to you as it is to me. All oaths are sacred. Nothing is more sacred than the act of giving your reason, your heart, and your will."

"Yes, it's quite a change to become a soldier."

"Well, sergeant, one idea connected with the sacrament is that it makes a *change* and in most cases is, as we say, *indelible*. Did it ever occur to you that, when you took the oath and at that instant became a soldier, in the eyes of military law, you crossed a line that you can never recross? You ceased to be a civilian and became a soldier. You can never become a civilian again. Even if you or I should be court martialed and thrown out of the Army for cause, our names will remain forever in the records in the Adjutant General's office as false and forsworn *soldiers*. Your parish priest might be unfrocked for cause but it takes away only his priestly authority and he'll be warned that God will judge him as a priest and not as a layman. Whatever you may think of sacraments, it does effect a change—and is indelible—is it not?"

"Well, Padre, I never thought of it that way."

"Are you married, sergeant?"

"Yes. Our church calls that a sacrament too and not just a contract."

"Did it ever occur to you that even the cold-blooded law sees something, even if dimly, in the idea of sacrament. If you should become widowed or divorced and later should wish to be married again, on your marriage license it could never be written "single." The license would say either "widowed" or "divorced." You can never again be a single man, strictly speaking. You'll forever remain a married man. The law is not blind on this point. It recognizes that a change has taken place and that it is indelible.

"Of course no churchman would think of repeating the sacraments of holy baptism or confirmation—at least on the practical ground that what is done is done. While the sacraments of penance, last rites, and Holy Communion are believed to effect a change, the change is not indelible. The human fact is that penitence is followed by sin again; the man at the point of death may recover; and the soul, like the body, must be nourished again and again.

"Sergeant, sacraments *are* the bunk if they are conceived to be priestly *magic* in your church or any other authoritarian church. The idea of magic is heresy. It is plain blasphemy. Also sacraments are suspect if, in the party-line of any authoritarian church, they are claimed to be its monopoly. The trouble is that they all make the same claim and a claim only they are. Obviously they are all right or all wrong. The truth would seem to be that in part each is right.

"Sergeant, to give this matter a different turn, let me suggest a few thoughts on a plane above the controversial. My copy of *The Catholic Encyclopedia Dictionary* admits that sacraments are older than the Christian Church and lists pre-Christian sacraments such as circumcision and the ordination of priests in the Mosaic Law.

"Let me add that the sacramental idea is grounded in the very nature of things and is the very pattern of human life in its most sacred aspects.

"This is what I mean. We are children of God. In religion we share the divine life with him. The beautiful and profound words in the priest's ritual at the administration of the blessed bread in the Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer, 'In thy heart, by faith, with thanksgiving,' tell you that the seat of religion is in the heart. When you give the gift of your heart to your country in the soldier's *sacramentum* or to another in the sacrament of Holy Matrimony, or to the Church in ordination, you give a gift that you can never take back. A mysterious change is involved. It is indelible. You may fail and be in default of duty to any of these but you can never cancel your gift.

"Even in the commonplace act of bestowing a gift, prompted by love for another, a spiritual change takes place. The gift so given in love is not the same identical object that the recipient might have bought in the marketplace. As theologians say, the physical 'accidents,' color, weight, form remain unchanged. The spiritual 'substance,' its innermost mysterious center is changed. That's why, if such a gift, prompted by love, is lost or stolen, we say that we deplore the loss because of 'associations.' That's a word with nothing less than deep and precious spiritual implications.

"Sergeant, as brothers in arms, we are bound together in the *sacramentum,* the soldier's sacred oath of loyalty and fidelity to country. Since above all religions is Religion, on that high plane let us make the sacramental idea the pattern of our living while life shall last."

(*Ed.* The Chaplain's clerk, seated in an adjoining room, of his own accord, took the conversation down in shorthand and gave the Chaplain a transcript for his file)

LIFE'S EVERLASTING VALUES

Emil Engelhardt

(A Sermon Preached at the First Church in
Plymouth, Mass., and The Unitarian
Fellowship of Hagerstown, Md.)

Am I right in saying that the testament of the Pilgrim Fathers is: "Never forget and never forfeit the Everlasting Values!" We live in a time when nearly everything has seemed to become uncertain and doubtful. Many people no longer know what is binding and valid and obligatory.

In this great world they see two, not only different but opposite, philosophies each maintaining to be the only correct one. One half of the world lives by Eastern maxims, the other half by Western principles. One of the most important questions to consider is: "Are there everlasting values and binding principles—binding upon everybody—and without which we cannot live as men on this earth?" Ralph Waldo Emerson writes in *Civilization:* "A puny creature is man, walled in on every side. Unless above himself he can erect himself, how poor a thing is man. But when his will leans on a principle, when he is the vehicle of ideas, he borrows their omnipotence."

When I allude to these values which are everlasting, I mean to imply that—speaking of values —we are not thinking of values as in a store, where everybody may choose between offered goods according to his taste. Everlasting values are not for choice or choosing. *THE* everlasting values are not made by man but are given him the moment he appears on earth. Man has to obey them, not to choose them. That is the reason I do not call them everlasting values but *THE* everlasting values, and these we know and can discern.

Am I again right in saying that those Pilgrim Fathers, the founders of America's oldest church, did know the everlasting values and because of this they came to America to make it possible to be free and to live accordingly? And, once resolved to abide with their beliefs and because their English church at home did not allow them to obey their own conscience, they took on all the hardships of the stormy ocean, the hunger and cold of that first winter, and the dangers of a wild and strange country.

Should not we, today, under so much better conditions and circumstances be, at least, as zealous as they were in conforming to the everlasting values?

But let us ask realistically: What are these values, which we deem an obligation of every man who yearns to build up a new and better and happier society of men and nations?

As Albert Schweitzer has told us, the first value is: reverence of life, especially reverence for each single living man. I don't mean just our friends or relatives or acquaintances. No. Each anonymous human being, BECAUSE he is a man, created by God to be or become a man as God intended him to be. Each man lives only once on this earth—never a second time. Everyone is unique and we must honor and revere his originality. We may not oppress nor restrain him. Furthermore, we should help him to develop all the potentialities and abilities dormant in him. Emerson says in *Domestic Life:* "I think the vice of our housekeeping is that it does not hold man sacred. The vice of government, the vice of education, the vice of religion is one with that of private life."

I think we should wonder that God always sends his children again and again into this world, to begin the task of building up anew a life worth living. It seems to me, that God puts his trust in each child, in spite of its weakness and helplessness as it is born of its mother, just as if He intended to say: "This is now your task; you, again try to become a real man or woman. Try daringly and dauntlessly to fulfill the mission of mankind." In his essay *Success* Emerson writes: "Believe, that if you are here, the authorities of the universe put you there and for cause or with some task strictly appointed you in your constitution and so long as you use your constitution and so long as you work at that, you are well and successful." And Martin Luther said: "You must believe, that God intends to work a great deed through you." Each new birth is a new promise of God showing He does not despair over men. Should not this knowledge remind and admonish us to revere each single human being as a creation of God without our taking into account whether we know him by name, know his business or his character?

But we ourselves cannot do everything for him. He, himself, must strive and aim all his life long for the high mark set for him by his Creator. "God will not have his work made manifest by cowards," says Emerson. We have a German verse which says: "In everyone lies the image of that which he is to become. As long as he does not realize this he cannot find peace and joy in life." May I also say: God has made only a rough design of that which he meant us to be. WE must develop this image to the highest possible perfection and then we may call the perfect man an individual or a person of character. Our high mark is not the impersonal mask of the

East, not the obedient slaves of tyranny but the free, responsible and conscientious person.

Our great German poet, Goethe, believed that we men of today are not yet the highest possible ideal and that the true meaning of man is not yet realized. Man is only a stepping stone of something much higher. Only an enhancement of man is of interest to God. Is not all our work in education and all our endeavor toward civilization intended to reach that goal? Man must become what God intended him to become. I try to become a real man, because I cannot become something else on this earth. But I believe that I will later on become complete like God, as Jesus said, under the only condition, that I become here a real man. Emerson writes in *Self-Reliance:* "Let a man know his worth and keep things under his feet. Let him not peep or steal or skulk up and down with the air of a charity boy, a bastard or an interloper in the world, which exists for him." And farther on: "It is easy to see that a greater self-reliance must work a revolution in all the offices and relations of man, in their religion, in their education, in their pursuits, their modes of life, their associations, in their property, in their speculative views." To realize this highest ideal of man is our second everlasting value.

We all know that we cannot command anyone to strive for this ideal of man. Each of us has to determine for himself. We cannot enforce but only urge and pray that each one uses his freedom and to realize these high ideals. I am sure you will understand that I, as a German, feel particularly and deeply the bitterness of the fact, that 17,000,000 of our German countrymen are not free to live as God made them. They have to think and act according to and obey the commands and enforcements of a small minority. Those oppressed men, women, and children must live a life of stealth and show a different face and feeling. Everyone in the world could learn from those oppressed people how necessary, how indispensable and how sacred freedom is for us all. We cannot become a full character without it. Freedom is an everlasting value and we have to fight for it just as unyieldingly as we strive for fresh air for our lungs. We cannot live without respiration. We cannot fulfill the ideal of man without freedom.

We, parents, teachers and preachers try to guide our children into freedom so that they may become able to guide and govern themselves. The New Testament has many important intimations on freedom. It seems to be the greatest gift of Jesus to mankind. As Paul wrote (Galaians 5) ". . . for freedom Christ has set us free . . . ." For you were called to freedom . . . ." Since the time of Jesus, it is the highest goal of mankind on earth. . . to become a free man and to remain free. It was the inspiring message of the early Christians to the decaying old world: ". . . the creation itself, will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God . . ." (Romans 8). If it is the goal of all creation to be set free should not MAN be the first to struggle for freedom? John (8-32) lets Jesus say: ". . . the truth will make you free . . . ." And what is this truth? I believe it is to become the man God meant him to be when he created him. Then the creative spirit of God is in the man. He is in harmony with himself and with the laws of nature and in harmony with God, the only reality we acknowledge as authority. ". . . where the spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom . . ." (2 Corinthians 3:17). We cannot be man without freedom because we cannot live without the spirit of God which is always creating a higher life on earth. So FREEDOM, to develop fully our personality, is our third everlasting value.

Perhaps timid people will ask: "But could not freedom become arbitrary? Would that not be a great danger to our society, our civilization and our welfare? Certainly we must all be careful to keep order and discipline. We Unitarians have two safeguards against any danger that freedom might become chaotic. First, there is the never-ending critical examination of our tradition. Goethe said: "We all live by tradition and come to ruin through tradition." He meant: we cannot live without the things men have invented, discovered and created in all the thousands of years before us. We should revere and praise them for all these gifts. But we must not idolize them. That would be our ruin. We must remain creative.

Martin Luther said: "In all things is hidden or concealed a word by which God speaks to us." When we hear it and answer by doing the right thing, then we live responsibly. If we, as Goethe said, heed the requirements of each new day and obey them, we are safe-guarded in that our freedom will never become dangerous to others. Thus, *responsibility* is the fourth everlasting value.

Responsibility teaches us to be tolerant to everybody but not that we think disdainfully: I don't mind him . . . that queer fellow . . . live and let live. Again Goethe said: Tolerance is not the highest end. We must also acknowledge the mind and the faith of those others. "Let him be" is an insult. I think that the genuine reverence of the otherness of man and of the other-mindedness according to our Unitarian practice will safe-guard us against intolerance, arrogance and dogmatism. That is our fifth everlasting value.

So we have established as the everlasting values without which no peaceful or creative society is possible: (1) reverence for life and the individuality of every man; (2) the life-long struggle for personality and character; (3) freedom

to think and believe and develop one's personality; (4) responsibility; (5) reverence for those of other minds.

Are not these old and hallowed words a program for mankind? "Love thy neighbor as thyself!" "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in heaven, is perfect." "For you are called to be free!"

And we believe that God, when he created man as the highest form of life on earth, did not mean an imperfect fragment. Rather as a likeness of himself and as his obedient tool and skillful instrument we are called to work in and on His world and to shape it into the Kingdom of God.

We are in God's hand
How strange now looks the life he makes us lead.
So free we seem, so fettered fast are we!
I feel He laid the fetter, let it lie!

—*Robert Browning*

A PRAYER

(Offered by Prof. James Luther Adams at the Ordination of a Unitarian Minister in June, 1958)

O Thou whose glory filleth all things, whose majesty is beyond the reach of our highest thought, but who hast breathed thine own Spirit into thy children and made them to be members of one family, in this solemn hour of consecration our minds and hearts turn to thee. As we are gathered within these hallowed walls we gratefully remember those who have ministered and worshipped here in other years and whose lives are to us a benediction and a challenge. We are grateful for our inheritance as followers of the Man of Nazareth for traditions and customs hallowed by the heroism and sacrifice which gave them birth; for the faith of which we claim kinship with Thee and by which we gain strength for confronting the demands of this age and hour.

Mindful of this kinship with Thee and with each other and mindful also of the magnitude of the common tasks that lie before us, we now one and all invoke thy blessings upon this service of consecration. May the sense of thy presence inspire in each of us an awareness of a tie that through Jesus binds us to Thee and to each other.

To him who is now dedicating himself to a ministry of leadership and fellowship, of reconciliation and healing, we pray that there may be granted a renewed vision of the reality that sustains us all, of the divine promise that dwells in every human soul, and of the City of God toward which we journey. May he as a disciple of the Master be filled with the spirit of self-denying and reasonable service, may he see the highest worth in the lowliest ministry, the wine of love in the cup of cold water, the bread of life in the cup that is shared. May he be a true priest, humble, patient, forgiving, by deeds more than words reflecting the glory of thy righteousness. May he be granted also, by the ever-recurring miracle of inspiration, the gift of prophecy, voicing in the house of God, the vision of the creative and re-creative, Thy blessing and judging purpose. May he speak words of flowing hope, of burning denunciation, of holy comfort, of Christlike trust, of the peace that passeth understanding. And as he goes his way among his people, may he bring with him a Presence not his own.

So may all our spirits be filled—so may all our hearts be consecrated, that this hour may be one of common dedication. May we all be ministers—doers of Thy will, bearers of Thy love, witness to Thy truth. In this house, hallowed by many prayers, both of the living and the dead, may there go up one prayer—that with this thy servant we may become a holy brotherhood, each looking not to his own things alone but to the things of others also, that this body of Christian men and women in the spirit of Christ may come nearer to the life of thy kingdom on earth. Amen.

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S DESK

NEWS FROM OUR FELLOWSHIP

Dr. James Luther Adams, Professor of Christian Ethics at Harvard Divinity School and a member of the Unitarian Christian Fellowship Board of Directors, has just returned from an extended trip westward on which he participated in a variety of Inter-Faith meetings. On August 1-2 he was chairman of a Colloquium on Religious Faiths and World Ethics in Brookline, Mass., where Buddhists, Christians, Hindus, Jews and Moslems discussed possible common grounds for a world ethic. Traveling to Chicago a few days later he participated in the International Congress for Religious Freedom and Liberal Christianity. At this Congress he was one of the panel Discussion leaders. In Japan he met with world scholars and attended the Ninth International Congress for the History of Religions and toured the country with visiting scholars. Later he lectured in Burma at the International Institute of Buddhistic Studies, at the Theological School of Serampore (Calcutta) and in Bagalore in South India. Dr. Adams told us something of his experiences when he was our speaker at our fall meeting on November 17 at a supper meeting at 6 P. M. at the Parish House of Old South Church in Boston.

Dr. Charles Forman, our new Editor, served as Dean of the Religious Education Institute at Star Island in July. Mrs. Paul H. Chapman served on his staff as leader of the Demonstration Class at the Kindergarten level.

Mr. Keith Warren, brought the greetings of Arlington Street Church, his former parish, to Dr. Dana McL. Greeley at his Inauguration on October 7 as President of the A.U.A.

Rev. David B. Loomis, the son of our honorary president, Mr. Robert H. Loomis, was ordained to the Unitarian ministry in June at the Arlington Street Church. Participating in the service were Dr. Dana Greeley, Dr. James Luther Adams, Rev. Paul H. Chapman, Rev. James P. Wilkes, Mr. Keith Warren, Rev. Harry Hoehler.

All Souls' Unitarian Church in Greenfield, of which Rev. Paul H. Chapman, our President, is minister, is rededicating its redecorated Sanctuary and remodeled Parish House on October 30. P. H. C.

The Editor welcomes contributions, letters and comments from our readers. Address: Box 43. Plymouth, Mass.

INTRODUCING OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Rev. James Luther Adams, Ph.D., Professor of Christian Ethics in Harvard University and Director of the Unitarian Christian Fellowship.

Rev. Paul H. Chapman, minister of the All Souls' Unitarian Church, Greenfield, Mass., is President of the Unitarian Christian Fellowship.

Rev. Frank B. Crandall is Minister Emeritus of the Second Church, Salem, Mass., and Major of the United States Army, Retired.

Rev. Emil Engelhardt is a retired Pastor of the German Lutheran Church. A lecturer in the *Volkshochschule* in Bremen, he is a leading member of the Unitarian Church of the Larger Fellowship and prominent in the activities of the German Unitarian movement.

Rev. Carl R. Scovel is minister of the First Parish Church in Sudbury, Mass.

Mr. Harry M. Stokes, a senior at the Harvard Divinity School, is a member of the Unitarian Church of Philadelphia and Assistant to the Minister at the First Church in Boston.

We believe you will find THE UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN both interesting and helpful. Its aim is to be:

- *Not dogmatic, but suggestive.*
- *Not controversial, but provocative of your own thought.*
- *Not blindly conservative, not defiantly radical, but always open-minded.*
- *An effort to seek the truth by preserving "all the good the past hath had," especially the words and personality of Jesus of Nazareth, and by reverently comparing notes with one another.*
- *In short, an intimate conversation in print.*

We extend a hearty welcome to all subscribers, old and new, large and small. However, in order that we may do full justice to the work in hand, we make an earnest appeal for the larger contributions.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. PARK, CONSTANT WENDELL

UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP 102 MT. VERNON ST.
BOSTON 8, MASS.

Name .....

Address .....

Enclosed:

☐ $2.00 for membership and magazine